



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

development of an anthropological literature were natural results. Herodotus already displays a commendable scientific attitude in his discussions of the manners and the customs of different peoples. Mr. J. L. Myers, in a lecture, calls him the father of anthropology no less than the father of history. He says:

Herodotus gives us for the first time a reasoned scheme of ethnological criteria; and it marks an advance on that of Aeschylus and an important modification of it. . . . So far as an ordered scheme of anthropological thought is concerned Herodotus is little, if at all, behind the best thought of our own days.

In a recent article, which appeared in *Hermes* 47, Karl Reinhardt presents an interesting argument to show that Democritus was the author of a systematic treatise on the evolution of the human race, which, he thinks, became the ancient authority on this topic, and was used not only by Epicurus, the source of Lucretius, but also by Hecataeus, the source of Diodorus, and by others. Each investigator is inclined to confer the prize of leadership on the author in whom he happens to be interested; but it is a little surprising to read in Miss Jane Harrison's *Ancient Art and Ritual*, 85, that Plutarch was the first anthropologist. In the light of Franz Boas's definition of anthropology (*American Anthropologist*, New Series 21 [1919]), "The scientific aim of anthropology is the reconstruction of the history of mankind as a whole", we must recognize the Greeks as anthropologists in a much wider sense than that in which I have been considering them, for the controlling interest in their philosophy, history, and art was centered in the physical and moral constitution of man. And it is a modern anthropologist who says, "The last word in anthropology is: Know thyself", quoting the Delphic inscription.

Greek scholars naturally glory in the originality of the Greeks; but to determine the nature of this originality and prove it is not so easy. Victor Hehn, in his *Culturpflanzen und Haustiere*, v, was probably not thinking of their originality when he adopted as his motto this sentence, by Schelling:

Was ist Europa als der für sich unfruchtbarer Stamm, dem alles vom Orient her eingepfropft und erst dadurch veredelt werden musste?

This motto is of course tempting to a student of oriental influence; but considerations such as I have essayed to bring before you, with the outstanding fact of the potential characteristics of the language of the Greeks, an unquestioned index of the intellectual alertness of the people, show us that the Greek race was not a wild tree that had to wait for grafting in order to bear fruit. The marked individuality of the Greeks is perhaps shown nowhere so distinctly as in their art. It is, however, anthropology that ought to have the last word on the question of originality. Marett, in his *Anthropology*, says:

To break through custom by the sheer force of reflection and so to make rational progress possible was the intellectual feat of one people, the ancient Greeks; and it is at least highly doubtful if, without their leadership, a progressive civilization would have existed today.

GOUCHER COLLEGE,
BALTIMORE.

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

REVIEWS

Attic Red-Figured Vases in American Museums. By J. D. Beazley, Student of Christ Church, Oxford. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford: University Press (1918). Pp. x + 236. \$7.50.

In 1910 an article entitled *Kleophrades* appeared in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, bearing the signature of J. D. Beazley, who up to that time was known only for an article on vases that had been recently acquired by the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. This article on *Kleophrades* at first did not receive among scholars in America the attention that its clean-cut, well-arranged matter demanded. In those days, students of vases thought that the whole art of attributing vases to their masters, and of identifying new painters was in the hands of a small group of Germans—Hartwig, Furtwängler, and Hauser. Hartwig's book, *Die Griechischen Meisterschalen der Strengen Rotfigurigen Stils*, remained the standard work of this kind; Furtwängler's identifications of the Niobid, Penthesilea, and Talos painters were everywhere regarded as showing extraordinary acuteness of perception. Therefore only a small number, a chosen few (this reviewer, a young graduate student at the time, cannot lay claim to being one), realized that, in the appearance of Mr. Beazley's paper, a new sun was rising in this practically unexplored country.

In the following year (1911), another article by Mr. Beazley, this time called *The Master of the Berlin Amphora*, appeared in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*; and it at once became evident that the field of attribution of unsigned vases to the ateliers of their makers had been merely scratched on the surface. In the years that followed, one article by Mr. Beazley succeeded another, usually in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, although papers from his pen have also been published in the *Annual of the British School at Athens*, the *Römische Mittheilungen of the German Archaeological Institute at Rome*, and the *American Journal of Archaeology*. All of these papers deal with the attribution of groups of unsigned red-figured vases to different artists, whose names are usually unknown, but who are called by such titles as *The Achilles Painter*, from the subject of his principal work, or *The Master of the Berlin Amphora*, from the museum or collection where his best and most representative piece is shown.

In the autumn of 1914, Mr. Beazley visited America. Up to that time, he had had no first hand knowledge of the American museums. The two gentlemen to whom his book is dedicated, Mr. Warren and Mr. Marshall, had shown him specimens acquired by them for American museums before they left their hands; and other details, photographs, etc., he acquired from curators and professors in this country. But he had never seen the collections in their entirety. He came, saw, and was conquered by the size and the excellence of the collections in the museums and Universities in the United States, particularly, of course, in New York and

Boston. So impressed was he that he determined to write a book on what he had seen over here; and the subject of this review is the result.

In a way, the title is a misnomer. It is not so much a description and discussion of the vase collections in America as a Beazleyan (if such a term can be used) history of the Attic red-figured technique from its beginning to the end of the fine style, or, more exactly, from Andokides to Meidias. It embodies the results of his researches not only in America, but also in Europe. The sixteen "masters" whom he had identified in his previously published articles are taken up in somewhat greater detail; the painters previously identified by other scholars are discussed, and usually new attributions are made, and some assignments by other hands denied; the lists of works by painters and potters whose names we know (Duris, Makron, the Brygos painter, Euthymides, etc.) usually receive many additions; but, more important than all this, he adds to his catalogue of "masters" no less than fifty-four new personalities. One of these, the "Briseis painter" (page 109) is, however, practically equivalent to Hartwig's "Meister mit dem Kahlkopf", while in the case of the "Lykos, Lysis, and Laches group" (111) he has brought together three of Hartwig's groups, although he does not think they are all by one hand.

To me, the most remarkable thing in the book, perhaps, is the manner in which the painter Myson has been resurrected (48-52). On the strength of a small fragment of a column-handled krater in the Museum on the Acropolis at Athens, Mr. Beazley has assigned no less than thirty vases to his hand, the most noteworthy example being the famous 'Croesus' amphora in the Louvre. Another case is that of the potter Oreibelos (194-195), whose painter is called by Mr. Beazley the "Painter of the Deepdene Amphora", as his principal work is a vase, formerly in the Hope Collection at Deepdene, and now in London in the possession of the Hon. Marshall Brooke. To this painter twenty-three vases are attributed, and Oreibelos is also brought back to life.

In this connection, it seems to the reviewer that the old theory that the hand that made the vase in many cases also painted the designs is not at all improbable, and that a general return to this belief is very likely. The startling discoveries made by Mr. Jay Hambidge, even if they prove nothing else, seem to show that the Attic potter was a conscious artist, who built up his vase according to a preconceived plan. This being the case, he was probably quite as capable of applying the design, as of fashioning his amphora or kylix. The work of Mr. Hambidge makes me believe that often potter and painter were one man—oftener than the modern school of vase experts would have us believe, and that such a man as Brygos, for instance, who never signs as painter, may have been both potter and painter, or the head of an establishment, who puts on the vase his signature as maker, but, as a matter of fact, painted the bulk of his vases also. Therefore I incline to the belief

that Oreibelos is probably painter as well as potter, and is the same person as Beazley's "master of the Deepdene amphora".

One is inclined to regret that Mr. Beazley has been obliged to employ such clumsy names for his new "masters" as "The Painter of the Louvre Centauro-machy Krater G367" (160), or "The Painter of Yale 165" (96), or such meaningless names, to Americans at least, as "The Flying-Angel Painter" (57-59), named for a vase in Boston, showing a satyr (whom he always calls a "silen") hoisting a smaller satyr up on his shoulders. In discussing this master, one finds one of the few actual mistakes in the description of a vase that occur in the book. In the case of the krater in Philadelphia (59) attributed to this painter, side B is side A of another vase of the same shape in the same museum.

On the other hand, his remark about Epiktetos (18), "You cannot draw better, you can only draw differently", comes pretty close to being epigrammatic; and flashes of the same kind of brilliant writing are scattered through the book, as for instance, "the Ambrosios painter is a bumpkin Skythes" (22), and his description of the forearms and hands of the Panaitios master's figures, that "they make most other hands seem gloved" (85), and many other turns of phrase too numerous to quote.

In his Preface (v), Mr. Beazley says, "I do not expect that my attributions will be unhesitatingly accepted, nor wish that they should". Indeed, in the opinion of this reviewer, many of his attributions may well be questioned. But the fact remains that in most cases they do check up remarkably, and in every case the method pursued is the right one, whether the result obtained is correct or not. It should be said in this connection, that in no case does this book supplement Mr. Beazley's earlier articles, referred to at the beginning of this review; nor is it a book for beginners; and therein lies one of its principal defects. Too little is said as to the points that vases in a group have in common, and the student is obliged to accept many statements without proof. To obtain a knowledge, therefore, of Mr. Beazley's methods of attribution, it is highly desirable to read his papers in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, and elsewhere, before using the book.

The indices are arranged according to (I) collections, (II) publications, (III) inscriptions. One looks in vain for an index of subjects, which should have been added. But Mr. Beazley is not interested in the story that a vase-painting tells; he is interested merely in its style and technique. The indices are not particularly well arranged, as compared with the admirable ones in Dr. Hoppin's work, *Handbook of Attic Red-Figured Vases*, that came out a little later than Mr. Beazley's book.

In binding, printing, paper, and margins, the book maintains the high standard of the Harvard Press. Mr. Beazley has been more than generous in his illustrations, which are taken from three sources: photographs, previous publications, and his own drawings. These drawings reveal him to be an expert archaeologi-

cal draftsman, with a keen eye for the essential details of style. For a book of this sort copious illustrations are demanded, and little fault can be found in this respect.

The book not only discloses Mr. Beazley's success as an identifier of nameless artists who flourished in the red-figured period ("The name of an artist is the least important thing about him", says he in his Preface, v), but also his unrivalled knowledge of museums and collections throughout the world. It is these things that make the book truly epoch-making—the greatest work of its kind, in the opinion of this reviewer, that has as yet appeared. It makes the pioneer work of Hartwig, Furtwängler, and Hauser in vases, at least, good as it is, appear like the performance of amateurs, and establishes the correct road that students of Greek vases should travel in assigning works to their painters.

In conclusion, a word of apology should be given for the late appearance of this review. Most of the statements here made have already been better said elsewhere; but a book of this importance should be brought to the attention of all to whom ancient Greece, her art and her life, are still living things. A late review may, therefore, succeed in reaching those who would not see any of the critiques that have appeared in other places, and who would not be aware of the existence of the book, and is for that reason not only entirely justifiable, but eminently suitable¹.

UNIVERSITY MUSEUM,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

STEPHEN BLEECKER LUCE.

A Handbook of Attic Red-Figured Vases. By Joseph Clark Hoppin. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford; Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1919). 2 volumes. Pp. xxiv + 472; viii + 600. \$8.00 per volume.

This book is one of the most important that has appeared in the history of the study of Greek vases. In it are brought together all the vases attributed to the hands of all of the different artists of the Attic red-figured period. Dr. Hoppin not only takes up those masters who sign their work, and whose names we therefore know, but he has also taken up those workers who do not sign their vases, but whose pieces are recognized on grounds of technique as being by one hand. These men have been identified by Hartwig, Furtwängler, Hauser, Pottier, and especially by the brilliant English scholar Mr. J. D. Beazley, whose book on Attic Red-Figured Vases in American Museums is epoch-making in this field. For all these vase-painters, Dr. Hoppin has compiled lists which seek to enumerate all the vases by their hands. He has followed the method of illustrating, wherever possible, the signed vases, and merely contents himself with listing the others. I shall return to this subject a little later.

¹For other reviews of the book see e. g. Burlington Magazine, August, 1919; E. M. W. Tillyard, in The Classical Review 33. 154-155; and J. C. Hoppin, in Art Bulletin, 2. 42-45.

The book has been out for over a year, and has been reviewed in many, if not in most, of the leading periodicals, both in America and in Europe¹. Yet the very lateness of the present review may enhance its value. It has been written after one year of constant use of the book, during which time the reviewer has had every opportunity to test its usefulness and merit, a fact which makes it of different significance from reviews that were written on the first appearance of the book. During this year of constant use the book has not only justified itself, but has caused some of us who were working with vases to wonder just what we had done before it came out. Working without it from now on is impossible.

It is true that the close critic can find many small mistakes, but these errors, in themselves slight, in no way detract from the value of the book.

As is inevitably the case with the work of the Harvard Press, the technical side of the book, i. e. the presswork and the binding, is beyond reproach. The heavy, fine paper, the clear type, and the wide margins are delights to the eye. The illustrations, too, are well reproduced. One heaves a sigh of despair at the price asked for the book, a book, which, as has been stated above, is indispensable for all who work in the field of Greek vases. Being, as it is, a combination of W. Klein's *Die Griechische Vasen mit Meistersignaturen* and Salomon Reinach's *Répertoire des Vases Peints*, it should be available to more persons than its price permits it to be. The fault lies in the increased cost of bookmaking.

Dr. Hoppin himself (Volume 1, Preface, v-vi) apologizes for his inability to procure illustrations of some of the signed vases, that have either disappeared, or else were in museums which, owing to the conditions brought about by the war, were inaccessible to him. In any criticism of the illustrations, therefore, it must be borne in mind that the work was done in war-time, when the museums in Germany, Austria, and Russia were not available. He is to be congratulated on having, even with these handicaps, secured pictures of nearly all the signed vases which he lists.

There is, however, one legitimate criticism in this respect, and that is that Dr. Hoppin has not inserted illustrations of representative vases by those artists who do not sign their works, but who have been identified by Mr. Beazley and others. The lack of such illustrations is much to be deplored, as it renders unnecessarily difficult the task of attributing unsigned vases to their painters. At least one illustration should have been given in each case; the result would have been greatly to enhance the value of the book.

Dr. Hoppin is especially to be congratulated on the business-like system of indices that he has inserted at the end of the second volume. These consist of a General Index (501-515), which concerns itself very largely with the subjects of the vases; indices of Dipinti

¹See e. g. reviews by Salomon Reinach, *Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature*, November 15, 1919; by Edmond Pottier, *Revue Archéologique*, Series V, 10.259-262; by E. M. W. Tillyard, *The Classical Review* 33.156; by D. M. Robinson, *Art Bulletin* 2. 123-128; and unsigned reviews, in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 39.243-244, and *The Review*, January 17, 1920.